

Serial No.: 10/616,743
Amdt. Dated 10/31/05
Reply to Final Office Action dated 08/31/05

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the above application be reconsidered, as amended. Claims 1-4, 6-22 are currently pending. Claims 1, 4, 10-12, 15 and 17 have been amended. Claims 2 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claim 23 has been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate therein the limitations of Claim 2.

Claims 4 and 15 have been amended to depend from claim 1.

Claim 10 has been amended to provide for an upper portion of said asymmetric reflectors, to provide antecedent basis for Claim 12.

Claim 11 has been amended to depend to new claim 23, which is added to provide antecedent basis for said upper portion.

Claim 12, which the Examiner had objected to for lacking antecedent basis for "said upper portions of each of said asymmetrical reflectors", has been amended to depend from Claim 10, thus rendering the objection moot.

Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate therein the limitations of Claim 19.

Support for the amendments are generally found in the pending claims.

No new matter is introduced. No additional claim fees are required.

As the matter is after final rejection and this response is made within two months of the action date, Applicants respectfully request that these amendments be entered and that an Advisory Opinion issue as soon as possible.

A. Response to Rejection of Claims 9, 11, 21, and 22 under 35 USC 112, 2nd para.

Claims 19, 11, 21, and 22 have been rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 9 to depend to claim 1 to provide antecedent basis for "said symmetrical reflector".

Applicants have amended claim 11 to depend to new claim 23, which is added to provide antecedent basis for said upper portion.

Claim 21 was objected to for lack of antecedent basis for "the at least one symmetrical reflector". However, Applicants have amended claim 17, from which claim 21 depends, to include said at least one symmetrical reflector.

Serial No.: 10/616,743
Amend. Dated 10/31/05
Reply to Final Office Action dated 08/31/05

Claim 22 was objected to for lack of antecedent basis for "the peak shape portion". However, Applicants have amended claim 17, from which claim 21 depends, to include said peak shape portion.

B. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 USC 102(b) as Anticipated by Rodin (US Patent 4,928,209)

Claims 1, 6-8, 13, 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Rodin. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the limitation from Claim 2 that provides at least one symmetrical reflector that is located centrally between said asymmetrical reflectors. Rodin does not teach or suggest a luminaire having a symmetrical reflector disposed between a pair of asymmetric reflectors.

Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's assertion that Rodin shows or suggests a peak shape portion located centrally above each lamp (claim 7), which can have an exterior angle of not less than 110° (claim 8). Rodin shows a reflector that has a continuous parabolic shape, whereas Applicants' reflectors have a peak shape above the lamp position (shown as elements 32 and 42 of FIGs. 2 and 3, respectively).

Nevertheless, in view of the dependency of claims 7 and 8, as well as claims 6 and 13 to amended claim 1, and of Claim 18 to amended Claim 17, this rejection and the Applicants' argument are moot. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the instant rejection in view of the claim amendments.

C. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 USC 103(a) as Unpatentable Over Rodin

Claims 3, 10, 14, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Rodin.

Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's assertion that Rodin shows or suggests a plurality of adjacent reflector segments, as provided in Applicants' claim 10, 11 and 12. Rodin shows a continuously curved reflector. The plurality of adjacent reflector segments are clearly shown in FIG. 2 (elements 33) and FIG. 3 (elements 43).

Nevertheless, in view of the dependency of all these directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, this rejection and the Applicants' argument are moot. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the instant rejection in view of the claim amendments.

Serial No.: 10/616,743
Amtdt. Dated 10/31/05
Reply to Final Office Action dated 08/31/05

D. Comments of Statement of Reasons for allowable subject matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of the application, and for allowing certain of Applicants' claimed embodiments. Applicants note that the list of elements of Applicants luminaire that are recited by the Examiner do not all reside in Applicants' broadest patent claim(s).

E. Conclusion

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Examiner's rejections and places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-18 and 20-23 as amended is respectfully requested.

Applicants would welcome a telephone call should the Examiner have any questions or comments with respect to this response.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Daniel F. Nesbitt
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,746
(513) 229-0383 x104
Customer Number 26868

October 31, 2005